



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/823,846	03/30/2001	Pascal Bensoussan	M-9972 US	7000
33031	7590	09/05/2006	EXAMINER	
CAMPBELL STEPHENSON ASCOLESE, LLP 4807 SPICEWOOD SPRINGS RD. BLDG. 4, SUITE 201 AUSTIN, TX 78759			JEANTY, ROMAIN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3623	

DATE MAILED: 09/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/823,846	BENSOUSSAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Romain Jeanty	3623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 June 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on June 5, 2006 has been entered. Claims 1-22 are pending in the application.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 3, 9-14, 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,006,192) in view of Masch (U.S. Patent No. 5,930,762).

Art Unit: 3623

As per claims 1, 3, 17-21, Cheng et al disclose a decision-making method for production planning in an uncertain demand environment comprising:

capturing assumption to create a scenario for one or more products for one or more time planning periods, specifying a component plan to be analyzed , the component plan identifying the quantities of each component that are positioned for each planning period (col. 3, lines 9-60).

Cheng et al disclose the concept of performance measurement for parameters and an identifying scenario (col. 2, lines 29-41), but Cheng et al does not expressly disclose submitting a request for analysis to an analytic engine for calculation of risk and performance indicators. Masch in the same field of endeavor disclosures a risk management system for calculating risk related using scenarios (col. 14, line 58 through col. 15 line 12; col. 16, lines 36-62). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the disclosures of Cheng et al to include the teachings of Masch in order to aid decision-makers in selecting an implementable strategy. Chen discloses the components include inventory available component (col. 4, line 4 through col. 5 line 20). However, Chen does not explicitly disclose where the components include un-inventoried available components. However, incorporating this feature into Chen would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention in order to provide inventory minimization and revenue maximization. . Furthermore, U. S. Patent No. 6,167,405 to Rosensteel, discloses a method to view different components of warehouse requests for analysis prior to execution by the warehouse, which reads on applicant claimed feature of

Art Unit: 3623

“specifying a component plan to be analyzed is performed prior to the submitting the request for analysis”. Note col. 2, lines 29-60 of Rosensteel.

As per claims 6 and 13, Cheng et al further discloses storing the component parameters in a database (col. 2, lines 42-46).

As per claims 9 and 14, claims 9 and 14 are data storage medium having machine-readable code stored thereon, the machine code comprising instructions executable by an array of logic elements, the instruction for performing the steps of method claim 1; therefore is rejected under the same rationale relied upon of claim 1.

As per claims 12, claim 12 is data storage medium for performing the steps of method claim 3; therefore is rejected under the same rationale relied upon of claim 3.

As per claim 16, claim 16 is a system for performing risk under uncertainty of method claim 1, with the only difference that claim 16 teaches a user interface. Cheng et al teaches such a user interface. Note col. 3, line 13 of Cheng et al.

5. Claims 2, 4-5, 7-8, 10-11, 15 and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,006,192) in view of Masch (U.S. Patent No. 5,930,762) and further in view of Li (U.S. Patent No. 6,453,303).

As per claims 2, 5 and 8, the combination of Chen et al and Masch does not explicitly disclose calculating one or more risk and performance indicators, returning the risk and performance indicators, storing the risk and performance indicators in a database or other persistent storage system. Li in the same field of endeavor discloses the concept of calculating risk of financial asset, performance of the asset and storing the risk and performance information (col. 7, lines 42-58). It would have been obvious to a person of

Art Unit: 3623

ordinary skill in the art to modify the disclosures of Chen et al and Masch to incorporate the teachings of Li in order provide timely analysis and advice for financial assets.

The combination of Chen et al, Masch and Li does not explicitly disclose the concept of specifying a component plan to be analyzed is performed prior to the submitting the request for analysis. However, it is old and well known in the art to analyze a plan before it is submitted for analysis. Therefore, incorporating this well known feature into the disclosures of Chen et al, Masch and Li would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art in order to determine some of the risk associated with the product before producing the product. Furthermore, U. S. Patent No. 6,167,405 to Rosensteel, discloses a method to view different components of warehouse requests for analysis prior to execution by the warehouse, which reads on applicant claimed feature of “specifying a component plan to be analyzed is performed prior to the submitting the request for analysis”. Note col. 2, lines 29-60 of Rosensteel.

As per claims 4, 7, 15, and 22, the combination of Chen et al and Masch fails to disclose retrieving the scenario and component plan from a database, constructing a message including the analysis parameters, the scenario and the component plan, sending the message to an analytic engine. Dietrich in the same field of endeavor teaches the concept of retrieving information and sending messages (col. 1 line 59 through col. 2, line 39). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Chen et al and Masch to include the teachings of Dietrich. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to maintain up-to-date plans as changes occur in the business environment.

Art Unit: 3623

As per claims 10 and 11, claim 10 and 11 are data storage medium for performing the steps of method claim 2; therefore are rejected under the same rationale relied upon of claim 2.


Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Romain Jeanty whose telephone number is (571) 272-6732. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs 7:30AM - 6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq R. Hafiz can be reached on (571) 272-6729. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

August 7, 2006


Romain Jeanty
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3623